

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended is respectfully requested. Claims 1-7, 29-32 and 58 are pending. In this Amendment claims 1, 7 and 29 are amended, claims 13-20 are cancelled, and new claim 58 is added. No new matter is added.

Support for new claim 58 is found in originally filed claim 7, as well as elsewhere in the originally filed specification, drawings and claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative on March 22, 2004, during a Telephone Interview (Examiner Interview) in which the outstanding rejections were discussed. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is contained in the comments below.

During the Examiner Interview, the Examiner indicated that he gives no patentable weight to the phrases "for at least two respective transceivers" and "for at least two transceivers" in claims 1 and 29, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 29 to remove these phrases. Furthermore, because the Examiner has given no patentable weight to these phrases, these phrases have not limited the scope of claims 1 and 29 according to the Examiner, and the removal of these phrases should raise no new issues for the Examiner with respect to the patentability of claims 1 and 29 and any claim dependent on claim 1 or 29.

Claims 1-4, 7 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,478,472 to Anderson *et al.* (Anderson). This rejection is obviated in part and traversed in part with respect to the claims as currently presented.

Claim 1 as currently presented claims a multi-optical receptacle assembly comprising at least two optical receptacles of a multi-transceiver assembly. In contrast, as discussed during the Examiner Interview, Anderson does not describe or show an optical receptacle for use with a transceiver, much less two or more optical receptacles for use

with a multi-transceiver assembly. Therefore, Anderson cannot teach or suggest the multi-optical assembly of claim 1, and claim 1 is patentable over Anderson.

Claims 2-4 and new claim 58 depend from claim 1, and, accordingly, include all of the patentable features of claim 1 as well as other patentable features. Therefore, claims 2-4 and claim 58 are patentable over Anderson for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 7 claims a multi-optical receptacle assembly including a unitary shared wall extending in a distal and/or a proximal direction between adjacent optical receptacles. In contrast, as discussed during the Examiner Interview, Anderson does not describe or show an optical receptacle including a unitary shared wall extending in a distal and/or a proximal direction between adjacent optical receptacles. Although the Office Action at page 2 states that Anderson shows a unitary shared wall, the Office Action has failed to identify a feature of Anderson corresponding to claim 7's unitary shared wall. For example, Anderson's rib 160 is not a shared wall as described and shown in the present application, because rib 160 is not a part of any optical receptacle. Rib 160 is a part of a connecting block 100 that is not an optical receptacle. Furthermore, Anderson does not describe or show a unitary shared wall *i.e.* a single wall that is of one piece and is a part of two optical receptacles as claimed by claim 7. Therefore, Anderson cannot teach or suggest the multi-optical assembly of claim 7, and claim 7 is patentable over Anderson.

Claim 29 claims a multi-optical receptacle assembly having a unibody construction. In contrast, as discussed during the Examiner Interview, Anderson does not describe or show a multi-optical receptacle assembly having a unibody construction. As defined in the present application at page 7, lines 28-30, a unibody construction "refers to a device such as an optical receptacle, transceiver housing, transceiver cage ***that is made from a single piece of material***" (emphasis added). Although the Office Action at page 2 states that Anderson shows multi-optical receptacle assembly having a unibody construction, the Office Action has failed to identify a feature of Anderson corresponding to claim 29's multi-optical receptacle assembly having a unibody construction. Anderson shows individual optical connectors 50 that are separate from each other and from connecting

block 100, so no combination of connectors 50 and connecting block 100 form a "unibody construction" *i.e.* a device made from a single piece of material. Therefore, Anderson cannot teach or suggest the multi-optical assembly of claim 29, and claim 29 is patentable over Anderson.

Claims 30-32 depend directly or indirectly from claim 29, and, accordingly, include all of the patentable features of claim 29 as well as other patentable features. Therefore, claims 30-32 are patentable over Anderson for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 29.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,478,472 to Anderson *et al.* (Anderson). This rejection is obviated with respect to the claims as currently presented.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1, either directly or indirectly, and, accordingly, include all of the patentable features of claim 1 as well as other patentable features. Therefore, claims 5 and 6 are patentable over Anderson for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

In addition, with respect to claims 6 and 7, these claims have been rejected on the basis of facts within the personal knowledge of the Examiner. The Examiner has identified no portion of Anderson that either describes or shows a unitary shared wall. At pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner merely makes the conclusory statement that Anderson shows a unitary shared wall and identifies no part of Anderson that that shows or describes a unitary shared wall. Therefore, claims 6 and 7 have been rejected on the basis of facts within the personal knowledge of the Examiner that have not been provided to the Applicants. Accordingly, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2) the Applicants hereby request that the Examiner provide an affidavit supporting the Examiner's assertion used as a basis for this rejection.


Also, with respect to claims 29-32, these claims have been rejected on the basis of facts within the personal knowledge of the Examiner. The Examiner has identified no

portion of Anderson that either describes or shows a multi-optical receptacle assembly having a unibody construction. At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner merely makes the conclusory statement that Anderson shows a unibody construction and identifies no part of Anderson that shows or describes a multi-optical receptacle assembly having a unibody construction. Therefore, claims 29-32 have been rejected on the basis of facts within the personal knowledge of the Examiner that have not been provided to the Applicants. Accordingly, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2) the Applicants hereby request that the Examiner provide an affidavit supporting the Examiner's assertion used as a basis for this rejection.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding the present response, the Examiner is invited to contact Mark J. Guttag at 703-591-2664, Ext. 2006.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Guttag
Reg. No. 33,057

JAGTIANI + GUTTAG
Democracy Square Business Center
10363-A Democracy Lane
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
703-591-2664

March 29, 2004